alternative methods, location, or time be chosen for the test. Concerns were also expressed about the impacts to marine life that might occur. These concerns focused on stress, loss of hearing, and loss of life, particularly among endangered species. Each of these concerns is considered and evaluated in the FEIS.

Regulations Governing the Testing Decision

The proposed action, shock testing the SEAWOLF submarine at an offshore site is consistent with Section 2366, Title 10, United States Code (10 U.S.C. 2366), which states that a covered system, such as a submarine, cannot proceed beyond initial production until realistic survivability testing of the system is completed. Realistic survivability testing means testing for the vulnerability of the system in combat by firing munitions likely to be encountered in combat with the test system configured for combat.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and Executive Order 12114, ''Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions'' require full evaluation of the impacts resulting from major federal actions. NEPA applies to federal actions within U.S. territory while Executive Order 12114 applies to activities and impacts outside territorial seas. The FEIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA and Executive Order 12114.

Executive Order 12898, ''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'' is intended to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on members of minority or low-income populations. Shock testing and associated mitigation operations will occur well offshore and would result in minor and/or temporary impacts to the test site with no significant direct or indirect impacts on the human population.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 prohibits jeopardizing endangered and threatened species or adversely modifying critical habitats essential to their survival. Section 7 of the Act requires consultation with the NMFS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to determine whether any endangered or threatened species under their jurisdiction may be affected by the proposed action. No formal consultation with USFWS was required because USFWS determined that there are no species or critical habitat under their jurisdiction that could be affected. Formal consultation with NMFS was completed when the NMFS issued a Biological Opinion on December 12, 1996.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) of 1972 establishes a national policy designed to protect and conserve marine mammals and their habitat. Section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA allows, upon request, the incidental (but not intentional) taking of marine mammals if certain findings are made and regulations issued. Permission may be granted if the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock and not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock for subsistence uses. Concurrent with the release of the DEIS, the Navy submitted an incidental small take application to the NMFS. Based on this application, the NMFA published a Proposed Rule on August 2, 1996 (61 FR 40377) and participated in joint public hearings. The Proposed Rule specified take limits as well as mitigation, monitoring and reporting requirements. A Final Rule must be issued before the shock test can proceed.

The Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (Ocean Dumping Act) of 1972 makes it illegal for any person to transport material from the U.S. for the purpose of dumping it into ocean waters. The term ''dumping'' as defined under the Act does not include intentional placement of any device in ocean waters for a purpose other than disposal.

Conclusion

Shock testing the SEAWOLF submarine in an area offshore of Mayport, Florida is the alternative that best meets the project purpose and need, satisfies operational criteria, and minimizes environmental impacts. Potentially significant direct impacts resulting from the test include mortality, injury, and acoustic harassment of marine mammals and sea turtles. While numbers have been calculated to define the potential lethal, injurious, and harassment take that might occur, it is expected that the mitigation and monitoring program will minimize the risk to marine mammals and sea turtles. Therefore, while the Navy has submitted an application for incidental take as previously discussed, no mortalities or injuries are expected to occur.

The alternative to performing the shock test at an area offshore of Mayport, Florida is to perform the test at an area offshore of Norfolk, Virginia. Most environmental impacts of shock testing were determined to be similar at Mayport or Norfolk. However, the two areas differ significantly with respect to potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. The most significant environmental difference between the areas is the much lower risk of impacts to marine mammals at the Mayport area. This comparison also indicates that Mayport has the lowest overall risk of significant environmental impacts. Considering all components of the physical, biological, and socioeconomic environment, potential impacts would be less at the Mayport area.

The ''No Action'' alternative would avoid all environmental impacts of shock testing. It does not, however, support the development of the best assessment of the survivability characteristics of the submarine. For that reason, it was dropped from further consideration.

Accordingly, the Navy selects the area off Mayport, Florida for the shock test of the SEAWOLF submarine. The SEAWOLF submarine would be shock tested in a manner consistent with the requirements stated by the NMFS and the description of the test in the FEIS. However, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (H.R. 4103) deletes the funding necessary to support shock testing in FY00. In light of this development, the Navy must reassess when, if ever, the shock test can be budgeted and conducted.

Dated: January 11, 1999.

H. Lee Buchanan,

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (RD&A).

[FR Doc. 99–1308 Filed 1–20–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Financial and Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before March 22, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202–4651, or should be electronically mailed to the internet address *Pat Sherrill@ed.gov*, or should be faxed to 202–708–9346.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708–8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Financial and Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: January 14, 1999.

Kent H. Hannaman,

Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Financial and Chief Information Officer.

Office of the Under Secretary

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Third National Even Start Evaluation: Performance Information Reporting System and Experimental Study.

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden: Responses: 1,350. Burden hours: 63,503.

Abstract: The third national Even Start evaluation calls for two data collection activities: (1) The Even Start Performance Information Reporting System involves the refinement and maintenance of a data collection system, collection and analysis of descriptive and outcome data from all Even Start grantees, and training of local Even Start project directors in data collection and technical assistance to them. (2) The Even Start Experimental Study involves recruiting 20 projects to participate in an experimental evaluation of the effectiveness of Even Start, random assignment of new families to Even Start or control groups, and measurement of child, adult, and family outcomes in fall 1999 and spring 2000.

[FR Doc. 99–1305 Filed 1–20–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of proposed information collection requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed information collection requests.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: An emergency review has been requested in accordance with the Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 3507(j)), since public harm is reasonably likely to result if normal clearance procedures are followed. Approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been requested by January 29, 1999. A regular clearance process is also beginning. Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before March 22, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the emergency review should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Danny Werfel, Desk Officer: Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget; 725 17th Street, N.W., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W. , Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, D.C. 20202–4651, or should be electronically mailed to the internet address *Pat__Sherrill@ed.gov*, or should be faxed to 202–708–9346.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708–8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Director of OMB provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. ED invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner, (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this